

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

GREG ADKISSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:13-CV-505-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	<i>Lead Case Consolidated with</i>
)	
KEVIN THOMPSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:13-CV-666-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	<i>as consolidated with</i>
)	
JOE CUNNINGHAM, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:14-CV-20-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	
BILL ROSE,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-17-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	
CRAIG WILKINSON, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-274-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	
ANGIE SHELTON, as wife and next of)	
Kin on behalf of Mike Shelton, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-420-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	

JOHNNY CHURCH,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-460-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
DONALD R. VANGUILDER, JR.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-462-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
JUDY IVENS, as sister and next of kin,)	
on behalf of JEAN NANCE, deceased,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-635-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		
PAUL RANDY FARROW,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-636-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
<hr/>		

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This case is before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Rules of this Court, and Standing Order 13-02.

Now before the Court is the parties' Joint Motion for Extension of Time for Mediation [Doc. 472 in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505; Doc. 455 in *Thompson*, 3:13-CV-666; Doc. 435 in *Cunningham*, 3:14-CV-20; Doc. 367 in *Rose*, 3:15-CV-17; Doc. 375 in *Wilkinson*, 3:15-CV-274; Doc. 356 in *Shelton*, 3:15-CV-420; Doc. 355 in *Church*, 3:15-CV-460; Doc. 359 in *Vanguilder*, 3:15-CV-462; Doc. 243 in *Ivens*, 3:16-CV-635; and Doc. 239 in *Farrow*, 3:16-CV-636], filed on

May 10, 2019.¹

Previously, on January 18, 2019, the Court found that this litigation is one that could benefit from mediation, and ordered the parties to mediate the case within one hundred fifty (150) days of the entry of the Order. [Doc. 459 at 5]. On March 22, 2019, the Court approved the appointment of Daniel J. Balhoff to serve as a mediator in the present case. [Doc. 466].

In the present motion, the parties seek an extension of the time for mediation and propose that the deadline for mediation be extended from June 17, 2019 until August 16, 2019. [Doc. 472 at 2]. The motion states that mediation has currently been set by the parties for May 30–31, 2019, but the parties and the mediator have agreed to postpone these dates if the joint motion is granted.

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Joint Motion for Extension of Time for Mediation [Doc. 472] is **GRANTED**. Within ten (10) days following the conclusion of the mediation, the mediator **SHALL file** a report with the Court stating the outcome of the mediation, as contemplated by Local Rule 16.4(m). If the parties are unable to completely resolve this litigation pursuant to mediation, they **SHALL report** to the Court, along with any updates to their Phase II trial proposals, within ten (10) days following the conclusion of the mediation, or by August 27, 2019.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTER:


United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the record refer to the docket entries in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505.